REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed on August 11, 2009 has been reviewed. Claims 1 and 3-37 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 3-37 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwob (U.S. Patent No. 5,393,713) in view of Briffe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,112,141) as evidenced by Wright (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,238). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 1 and 3-4

Claim 1 recites a device having:

> a database of radio frequency information stored as a function of radio frequency; and
>
> a circuit coupled to the database and operating one or more algorithms for accessing the database as a function of an input radio frequency signal and generating a display signal as a function of the input radio frequency signal and a current position signal for an aircraft, the display signal including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information from the database.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Schwob does not teach all of the limitations of claim 1. Nor does any combination of Schwob, Wright, or Briffe render the limitations of amended claim 1 obvious.

The Schwob reference generally teaches:

> [a] broadcasting system capable of automatically or semi-automatically updating its database and using the database to identify received broadcasting stations, and search for stations according to user-chosen attributes and current data. The receiver is capable of receiving current location information within the received

> data stream, and also of determining the current location of the receiver by using a received station attribute. The receiver is capable of identifying and searching for, any station in any band the receiver is capable of receiving.

Schwob, Abstract.

Further, the Schwob reference indicates that:

> [o]nce a user has entered or received the city and state data for the location of the receiver, the control module 1 immediately can determine the available stations within the broadcast region.

Schwob, col. 11, lines 44-47.

First, Schwob does not teach "a database of radio frequency information stored as a function of radio frequency" as recited in claim 1. The Schwob reference describes the database shown in FIG. 6 as follows:

> Accordingly, in the example shown in FIG. 6, the database is portioned according to the three basic identifying criteria: 1) a STATES file 250; 2) a CITIES file 252; and 3) a broadcast BAND frequency file 254 based on geographical grouping called grids. Though, only one BAND is shown in FIG. 6, there may actually be separate BAND files for AM, FM, shortwave and so on.
>
> Once a user has entered or received the city and state data for the location of the receiver, the control module 1 immediately can determine the available stations within the broadcast region. Accordingly, the STATES file 250 contains two data fields: 1) the "abbreviation" field 256 contains one two-letter record for each state covered in the database; 2) the "city point" field 258 contains a unique address for each state record that identifies the first city record for that state in the CITIES file 252. The "state number" 260 is derived from the record position in the STATE file.
>
> The CITIES file 252 contains four data fields: 1) a "city name" field 262 that contains an alphabetized record entry for each city covered in the database organized by state; 2) a "state number" field 266 that identifies the state each city is in; and 3) one or more grid pointers 268, 270 that identify for each city a unique address in the BAND file 254 for the first broadcast station in the corresponding geographic region where the receiver is located. Each record (consisting of the data in the four fields) is located at a unique address 264 in the CITIES file that indicates the position of the record in the file wherein the address of the first city for each state grouping (field 266) is the same as the corresponding city pointer

> 258 located in the STATES file 250. The BAND file 254 contains all the available station entries covered in the database organized by geographic regions with each region assigned a unique grid number stored in field 272. The BAND file 254 also contains the attribute data for each station such as the "frequency" field 274, the "call letter" field 276, the "city pointer" field 282, and the "format" field 278. Each station of course has a unique address 280 wherein the address 280 for the first station in each grid region grouping (field 272) is the same as the corresponding grid pointer 268 or 270 located in the CITIES file.

Schwob, Col. 11, line 36 – Col. 12, line 22; *see* Schwob, Figure 6.

The Examiner points to sections of Schwob discussing the "broadcast BAND frequency file" portion of the database and argues that this limitation is taught. *See* Schwob, Col. 11, lines 36-54. Applicant disagrees with the conclusion of the Final Office Action and respectfully asserts that even if the Schwob reference teaches a radio frequency component in a database, it does not teach "a database of radio frequency information stored as a function of radio frequency" as recited in claim 1.

Second, Schwob does not teach "generating a display signal as a function of the input radio frequency signal and a current position signal for the aircraft" as recited in claim 1. The Schwob reference teaches that:

> [o]nce a station has been locked onto, as at step 208, the control module 1 at step 310 accesses the corresponding station information stored in ROM 3 based on the grid (geographic region) pointers, previously stored in memory during the state/city selection by the user.

Schwob, Col. 13, lines 6-15.

While Schwob teaches accessing the corresponding station information stored in ROM 3 based on the grid pointers, Schwob does not teach or suggest "generating a display signal as a function of the input radio frequency signal and a current position signal for the aircraft" as recited in claim 1.

Third, Schwob does not teach the "display signal including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information from the database" as recited by claim 1. The Schwob reference describes various embodiments of receivers, such as:

> [t]he receiver illustrated in FIG. 5 also includes country, state and city input switches 208 while the receiver illustrated in FIG. 15 also includes city and state switches 212 and 214. These permit the user in combination with the up/down switches 34′, 35′ to program into the control module 1 the geographic location of the receiver. As explained hereinabove, this permits the control module 1 to access the correct portion of the database stored in ROM 3 that corresponds to the actual location of the receiver.
>
> The receiver illustrated in FIG. 15 also includes compass direction input switches or key 210 which are used to update the location of the receiver as explained elsewhere herein.
>
> As previously described, two alternatives to having the user manually enter the geographic location of the receiver, are (1) determining the approximate geographic location of the receiver by using the geographic location data transmitted by sending station, and (2) determining the geographic location by receiving the station attribute and searching the ROM database. The internal configuration and operation of the receivers are substantially the same as explained with reference to FIG. 1, with the addition, of course, that the keyboard input 7 now includes the individual format, language, station and alphanumeric input and selection buttons or keys 200, 202, 204, 206 and 208 (FIG. 5) and format, state, city and compass direction keys 200, 210, 212, and 214 (FIG. 15).

Schwob, col. 10, line 61 – col. 11, line 21; *see* Schwob, Figures 5 and 15.

The Examiner cites items 210 and 200 of Figure 15 of Schwob in conjunction with the description at col. 10 lines 61-68 and col. 11, lines 1-21 of Schwob in support of his argument that Schwob teaches this limitation. Respectfully, it appears the Examiner erroneously equates the "pushbutton input switches or keys 200" (col. 9, lines 60-62) on the front of the receiver shown in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft communication information" that is a part of the "display signal" as recited in claim 1. In addition, it appears that the Examiner erroneously equates the "compass direction input switches or key 210" (col. 11, lines 3-6) on the front of the receiver shown in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft navigation information" that is a part of the "display

signal" as recited by claim 1. Applicant asserts that the Examiner's arguments are improper because, the Examiner improperly characterizes the inputs 200 and 210 shown in FIG. 15 of Schwob as communication information and navigation information. These inputs 200 and 210 are inputs provided by the user, not information from the database as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, the teachings of Schwob do not render the claim limitations of claim 1 obvious. Neither does Wright or Briffe, either alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies in Schwob.

Write is drawn to

> a system and method for providing a retrievable record of the flight performance of an aircraft and for exchanging information to and from an aircraft, and more particularly, this invention relates to a system and method for providing a retrievable record of the flight performance of an aircraft and for exchanging information to and from an aircraft using automatic frequency channel selection.

See, Write, Col. 1, lines 5-13. Write, either alone or in combination with Schwob, does not teach or suggest the limitations "a database of radio frequency information stored as a function of radio frequency", "generating a display signal as a function of the input radio frequency signal and a current position signal for the aircraft", and "display signal including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information from the database" as provided in claim 1.

Briffe is drawn to "an improved aircraft control interface" (Briffe, Col., 1, lines 8-9) and more particularly

> The computer simultaneously displays on the display device selected portions of the map database as a visible map display and portions of the aeronautical information database as aeronautical information indicators such that the geographic locations of aeronautical information indicators are correlated on the display device with the corresponding geographic

> locations of the map display. The computer also generates a movable cursor on the display device, the position of the cursor controlled by the cursor control device; and responds to operation of the cursor control device and selection device to highlight navigation aid indicators at the current cursor location and to store portions of the aeronautical information database corresponding to the highlighted navigation aid indicators in the memory. Sequential operation of the cursor control device and selection device is thus operative to store a flight plan in the memory.

See, Briffe, Col. 3, lines 7-50. The Examiner in particular points to the touch sensitive screen 502 of FIG. 17-19a, in support of his assertion that Briffe discloses providing an aircraft with navigation and communication information on an aircraft display and that it would be obvious of one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the information retrieval techniques disclosed by Schwob to the aircraft display and database discussed in Briffe.

However, Briffe, either alone or in combination with Schwob and Write, does not teach or suggest the limitations "a database of radio frequency information stored as a function of radio frequency", "generating a display signal as a function of the input radio frequency signal and a current position signal for the aircraft", and "display signal including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information from the database" as provided in claim 1.

Because neither Wright nor Briffe teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 which are deficient from the teachings of Schwob, claim 1 is drawn to novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 3-4 either directly or indirectly depend from and further define independent claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons described. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-9

Claim 5 recites an aircraft frequency identifier device for an aircraft, comprising:

> a database of stored radio frequency information; and
>
> a processor coupled to the database and operating one or more algorithms for generating a display signal as a function of an input radio frequency signal and a current position signal for the aircraft, the display signal including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information from the database.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Schwob does not teach all of the limitations of claim 5. Nor does any combination of Schwob, Wright, or Briffe render the limitations of amended claim 5 obvious.

First, Schwob does not teach "generating a display signal as a function of an input radio frequency signal and a current position signal for the aircraft" as recited in claim 5. Instead, Schwob teaches "[o]nce a station has been locked onto, as at step 208, the control module 1 at step 310 accesses the corresponding station information stored in ROM 3 based on the grid (geographic region) pointers, previously stored in memory during the state/city selection by the user" (*See* Schwob, Col. 13, lines 6-15) which does not teach or suggest the above limitations of claim 5.

Second, Schwob does not teach the "display signal including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information from the database" as recited by claim 5. The Examiner again cites items 210 and 200 of Figure 15 of Schwob in conjunction with the description at col. 10 lines 61-68 and col. 11, lines 1-21 of Schwob in support of his argument that Schwob teaches this limitation. Respectfully, it appears the Examiner erroneously equates the "pushbutton input switches or keys 200" (col. 9, lines 60-62) on the front of the receiver shown in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft communication information" that is a part of the "display signal" as recited in claim 5. In addition, it appears that the Examiner erroneously equates the "compass direction input switches or key 210" (col. 11, lines 3-6) on the front of the receiver shown

in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft navigation information" that is a part of the "display signal" as recited by claim 5. Applicant asserts that the Examiner's arguments are improper because, the Examiner improperly characterizes the inputs 200 and 210 shown in FIG. 15 of Schwob as communication information and navigation information. These inputs 200 and 210 are inputs provided by the user, not information from the database as recited in claim 5.

For at least these reasons, the teachings of Schwob do not render the claim limitations of claim 5 obvious. Neither does Wright or Briffe, either alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies in Schwob for the reasons already discussed above. Thus, claim 5 is drawn to novel and nonobvious subject matter and therefore is allowable.

Claims 6-9 either directly or indirectly depend from and further define independent claim 5 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons described. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-15

Claim 10 recites a device comprising:

> a database of radio frequency information stored as a function of radio frequency and a current position of an aircraft; and
>
> a processor having a first input structured to receive a signal indicative of an input radio frequency and a second input structured to receive a signal indicative of the current position of the aircraft, the processor coupled to the database and operating one or more algorithms for retrieving a portion of the radio frequency information as a function of a signal indicative of an input radio frequency received on the first input and a signal indicative of the current position of the aircraft received on the second input, the portion of the radio frequency information including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Schwob does not teach all of the limitations of claim 10. Nor does any combination of Schwob, Wright, or Briffe render the limitations of amended claim 10 obvious.

First, Schwob does not teach "a database of radio frequency information stored as a function of radio frequency and a current position of an aircraft" as recited in claim 10. Again, the Examiner points to sections of Schwob discussing the "broadcast BAND frequency file" portion of the database and argues that this limitation is taught. *See* Schwob, Col. 11, lines 36-54. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's arguments and asserts that even if the Schwob reference teaches a radio frequency component in a database, it does not teach "a database of radio frequency information stored as a function of radio frequency and a current position of an aircraft" as recited in claim 10.

Second, Schwob does not teach "retrieving a portion of the radio frequency information as a function of a signal indicative of an input radio frequency received on the first input and a signal indicative of the current position of the aircraft received on the second input" as recited in claim 10. Even while the Schwob reference states "[o]nce a station has been locked onto, as at step 208, the control module 1 at step 310 accesses the corresponding station information stored in ROM 3 based on the grid (geographic region) pointers, previously stored in memory during the state/city selection by the user," Schwob does not teach or suggest retrieving a portion of the radio frequency information as a function of a signal indicative of an input radio frequency received on the first input and a signal indicative of the current position of the aircraft received on the second input" as recited in claim 10. *See* Schwob, Col. 13, lines 6-15.

Third, Schwob does not teach the "portion of the radio frequency information including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information" as recited by claim 10. The Examiner again cites items 210 and 200 of Figure 15 of Schwob in conjunction with the description at col. 10 lines 61-68 and col. 11, lines 1-21 of Schwob in support of his argument that Schwob teaches this limitation. Respectfully, it appears the Examiner erroneously equates the "pushbutton input switches or keys 200"

(col. 9, lines 60-62) on the front of the receiver shown in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft communication information" that is a part of the "portion of the radio frequency information" as recited in claim 10. In addition, it appears that the Examiner erroneously equates the "compass direction input switches or key 210" (col. 11, lines 3-6) on the front of the receiver shown in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft navigation information" that is a part of the "aircraft communication information" as recited in claim 10. Applicant asserts that the Examiner's arguments are improper because, the Examiner improperly characterizes the inputs 200 and 210 shown in FIG. 15 of Schwob as communication information and navigation information. These inputs 200 and 210 are inputs provided by the user, not information provided from the database as recited in claim 10.

For at least these reasons, the teachings of Schwob do not render the claim limitations of claim 10 obvious. Neither does Wright or Briffe, either alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies in Schwob for the reasons discussed above. Thus, claim 10 is drawn to novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, claim 10 is allowable.

Claims 11-15 either directly or indirectly depend from and further define independent claim 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons described. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-21

Claim 16 recites an aircraft frequency identifier comprising:

> a means for storing radio frequency information;
>
> an accessing means, coupled to the storing means, for accessing the stored radio frequency information as a function of an input radio frequency signal and a current position signal for an aircraft; and
>
> an output signal generating means, coupled to the accessing means, for generating an output signal as a function of the accessed radio frequency

information, the output signal including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Schwob does not teach all of the limitations of claim 16. Nor does any combination of Schwob, Wright, or Briffe render the limitations of amended claim 16 obvious.

Schwob does not teach "an output signal generating means, coupled to the accessing means, for generating an output signal as a function of the accessed radio frequency information, the output signal including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information" as recited in claim 16. The Examiner references steps 306-310 and step "display station data" of FIG. 7 of Schwob and step 1402 of FIG. 14 of Schwob in support of his assertion that these limitations are taught by Schwob. Applicant disagrees and asserts that FIG. 7 and FIG. 14, along with the written description describing the figures, do not teach "the output signal including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information" as recited in claim 16. The description accompanying FIG. 7 indicated that "the control module 1 displays the station information on display 8′ as previously explained herein." While Schwob describes display of station information, it does not indicate that the station information includes communication information and aircraft navigation information as recited in claim 16. *See* Schwob, Col. 13, lines 6-15.

For at least these reasons, the teachings of Schwob do not render the claim limitations of claim 16 obvious. Neither does Wright or Briffe, either alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies in Schwob for the reasons discussed above. Thus, claim 16 is drawn to novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 17-21 either directly or indirectly depend from and further define independent claim 16 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons described. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-25

Claim 22 recites a device comprising:

> database means for storing radio frequency information as a function of radio frequency and a current position of an aircraft; and
>
> processor means for receiving a first signal indicative of an input radio frequency and a second signal indicative of the current position of the aircraft, the processor means coupled to the database means for retrieving a portion of the radio frequency information as a function of a first signal indicative of an input radio frequency and a second signal indicative of the current position of the aircraft, the portion of the radio frequency information including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Schwob does not teach all of the limitations of claim 22. Nor does any combination of Schwob, Wright, or Briffe render the limitations of amended claim 22 obvious.

First, Schwob does not teach "database means for storing radio frequency information as a function of radio frequency and a current position of an aircraft" as recited in claim 22. Again, the Examiner points to sections of Schwob discussing the "broadcast BAND frequency file" portion of the database and argues that this limitation is taught. *See* Schwob, Col. 11, lines 36-54. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's arguments and asserts that even if the Schwob reference teaches a radio frequency component in a database, it does not teach "database means for storing radio frequency information as a function of radio frequency and a current position of an aircraft" as recited in claim 22.

Second, Schwob does not teach "processor means coupled to the database means for retrieving a portion of the radio frequency information as a function of a first signal indicative of an input radio frequency and a second signal indicative of the current position of the aircraft" as recited in claim 22. While the Schwob reference states "[o]nce a station has been locked onto, as at step 208, the control module 1 at step 310

accesses the corresponding station information stored in ROM 3 based on the grid (geographic region) pointers, previously stored in memory during the state/city selection by the user," Schwob does not teach or suggest "retrieving a portion of the radio frequency information as a function of a first signal indicative of an input radio frequency and a second signal indicative of the current position of the aircraft" as recited in claim 22. *See* Schwob, Col. 13, lines 6-15.

Third, Schwob does not teach the "portion of the radio frequency information including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information" as recited by claim 22. The Examiner again cites items 210 and 200 of Figure 15 of Schwob in conjunction with the description at col. 10 lines 61-68 and col. 11, lines 1-21 of Schwob in support of his argument that Schwob teaches this limitation. Respectfully, it appears the Examiner erroneously equates the "pushbutton input switches or keys 200" (col. 9, lines 60-62) on the front of the receiver shown in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft communication information" that is a part of the "portion of the radio frequency information" as recited in claim 22. In addition, it appears that the Examiner erroneously equates the "compass direction input switches or key 210" (col. 11, lines 3-6) on the front of the receiver shown in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft navigation information" that is a part of the "aircraft communication information" as recited in claim 22. Applicant asserts that the Examiner's arguments are improper because, the Examiner improperly characterizes the inputs 200 and 210 shown in FIG. 15 of Schwob as communication information and navigation information. These inputs 200 and 210 are inputs provided by the user, not information provide by the processor as recited in claim 22.

For at least these reasons, the teachings of Schwob do not render the claim limitations of claim 22 obvious. Neither does Wright or Briffe, either alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies in Schwob for the reasons discussed above. Thus, claim 22 is drawn to novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, claim 22 is allowable.

Claims 23-25 either directly or indirectly depend from and further define independent claim 22 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons described. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 26-31

Claim 26 recites a method of identifying an aircraft frequency, comprising:

> storing radio frequency information;
>
> accessing the stored radio frequency information as a function of an input radio frequency signal and a current position signal of an aircraft; and
>
> generating an output signal as a function of the accessed radio frequency information, the output signal including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information.

The Examiner asserts that all of the limitations of claim 26 have been analyzed in claim 16. As shown above with respect to claim 16, Schwob does not teach all of the limitations of claim 26. Nor does any combination of Schwob, Wright, or Briffe render the limitations of amended claim 26 obvious for the reasons also discussed above with respect to claim 16.

For at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 16, the teachings of Schwob, Wright, and Briffe, either alone or in combination, do not render the claim limitations of claim 26 obvious. Thus, claim 26 is drawn to novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, claim 26 is allowable.

Claims 27-31 either directly or indirectly depend from and further define independent claim 26 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons described. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 32-35

Claim 32 recites a method of identifying an aircraft frequency, comprising:

> storing radio frequency information in a database as a function of radio frequency and a current position of an aircraft;
>
> receiving in a processor a first signal indicative of an input radio frequency and a second signal indicative of the current position of the aircraft; and
>
> retrieving from the database a portion of the radio frequency information as a function of a first signal indicative of an input radio frequency and a second signal indicative of position, the portion of the radio frequency information including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information.

The Examiner asserts that all of the limitations of claim 32 have been analyzed in claim 16 and claim 10. As shown above with respect to claims 10 and 16 Schwob does not teach all of the limitations of claim 32. Nor does any combination of Schwob, Wright, or Briffe render the limitations of amended claim 32 obvious for the reasons provided above.

For at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 16 and claim 10, the teachings of Schwob, Wright, and Briffe, either alone or in combination, do not render the claim limitations of claim 32 obvious. Thus, claim 32 is drawn to novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, claim 32 is allowable.

Claims 33-35 either directly or indirectly depend from and further define independent claim 32 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons described. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 36

Claim 36 recites a method of providing information to a user, the method comprising:

> manually tuning a radio to a desired frequency;
>
> receiving current position information for an aircraft;
>
> accessing a database having information corresponding to multiple frequencies, wherein a subset of such information associated with the manually tuned frequency at the received current position information for the aircraft is retrieved as function of the manually tuned frequency and the current position information for the aircraft, the subset of such information including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information; and
>
> displaying the subset of information in conjunction with the manually tuned frequency.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Schwob does not teach all of the limitations of claim 36. Nor does any combination of Schwob, Wright, or Briffe render the limitations of claim 36 obvious.

Schwob does not teach "wherein a subset of such information associated with the manually tuned frequency at the received current position information for the aircraft is retrieved as function of the manually tuned frequency and the current position information for the aircraft, the subset of such information including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information" as recited in claim 36. Even while the Schwob reference teaches "[o]nce a station has been locked onto, as at step 208, the control module 1 at step 310 accesses the corresponding station information stored in ROM 3 based on the grid (geographic region) pointers, previously stored in memory during the state/city selection by the user," Schwob does not teach or suggest "wherein a subset of such information associated with the manually tuned frequency at the received current position information for the aircraft is retrieved as a function of the manually tuned frequency and the current position information for the aircraft" as recited in claim 36. *See* Schwob, Col. 13, lines 6-15.

The Examiner again cites items 210 and 200 of Figure 15 of Schwob in conjunction with the description at col. 10 lines 61-68 and col. 11, lines 1-21 of Schwob in support of his argument that Schwob teaches the limitation that "the subset of such information including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information" as recited in claim 36. As discussed above, it appears the Examiner erroneously equates the "pushbutton input switches or keys 200" (col. 9, lines 60-62) on the front of the receiver shown in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft communication information" recited in claim 36. In addition, it appears that the Examiner erroneously equates the "compass direction input switches or key 210" (col. 11, lines 3-6) on the front of the receiver shown in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft navigation information" recited in claim 36. Applicant asserts that the Examiner's arguments are improper because, the Examiner improperly characterizes the inputs 200 and 210 shown in FIG. 15 of Schwob as communication information and navigation information. These inputs 200 and 210 are inputs, not information components of a subset of information retrieved from the database as recited in claim 36.

For at least these reasons, the teachings of Schwob do not render the claim limitations of claim 36 obvious. Neither does Wright or Briffe, either alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies in Schwob. Thus, claim 36 is drawn to novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, claim 36 is allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 37

Claim 37 recites a method of providing information to a user, the method comprising:

> manually tuning a radio to a desired frequency; receiving current position information for an aircraft;
>
> accessing a database having radio frequency information corresponding to multiple frequencies at various locations, wherein a subset of such radio

frequency information associated with the manually tuned frequency at the received current position information for the aircraft is retrieved as function of the manually tuned frequency and the current position information for the aircraft, the subset of radio frequency information including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information; and

displaying the subset of radio frequency information in conjunction with the manually tuned frequency.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Schwob does not teach all of the limitations of claim 37. Nor does any combination of Schwob, Wright, or Briffe render the limitations of amended claim 37 obvious.

Schwob does not teach "wherein a subset of such radio frequency information associated with the manually tuned frequency at the received current position information for the aircraft is retrieved as function of the manually tuned frequency and the current position information for the aircraft, the subset of radio frequency information including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information" as recited in claim 37. Even while the Schwob reference teaches "[o]nce a station has been locked onto, as at step 208, the control module 1 at step 310 accesses the corresponding station information stored in ROM 3 based on the grid (geographic region) pointers, previously stored in memory during the state/city selection by the user," Schwob does not teach or suggest "wherein a subset of such radio frequency information associated with the manually tuned frequency at the received current position information for the aircraft is retrieved as function of the manually tuned frequency and the current position information for the aircraft" as recited in claim 37. *See* Schwob, Col. 13, lines 6-15.

The Examiner again cites items 210 and 200 of Figure 15 of Schwob in conjunction with the description at col. 10 lines 61-68 and col. 11, lines 1-21 of Schwob in support of his argument that Schwob teaches the limitation that "the subset of radio frequency information including aircraft communication information and aircraft navigation information" as recited in claim 37. As discussed above, it appears the Examiner erroneously equates the "pushbutton input switches or keys 200" (col. 9, lines

60-62) on the front of the receiver shown in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft communication information" recited in claim 37. In addition, it appears that the Examiner erroneously equates the "compass direction input switches or key 210" (col. 11, lines 3-6) on the front of the receiver shown in FIG. 15 (col. 4, lines 8-10) with the "aircraft navigation information" recited in claim 37. Applicant asserts that the Examiner's arguments are improper because, the Examiner improperly characterizes the inputs 200 and 210 shown in FIG. 15 of Schwob as communication information and navigation information. These inputs 200 and 210 are inputs, not information components of a subset of radio frequency information that is retrieved from the database as recited in claim 37.

For at least these reasons, the teachings of Schwob do not render the claim limitations of claim 37 obvious. Neither does Wright or Briffe, either alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies in Schwob. Thus, claim 37 is drawn to novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, claim 37 is allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims **1 and 3-37** are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 13, 2009

/ J. Patrick Kendrick /

J. Patrick Kendrick
Reg. No. 53109

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg & Powers LLC
5810 W. 78th Street, Ste. 100
Minneapolis, MN 55439
T – (952) 465-0770
F – (952) 465-0771